JOHN BARCLAY
HIS
DEFENCE
OF THE MOST
Holy Sacrament
OF THE
EUCHARIST,
TO THE
SECTARIES
OF THE
TIMES.

BOOK II. CHAP. II.

Engliſhed by a Perſon of Quality.

With Allowance.

LONDON,
Printed by *Mary Thompſon* at the Entrance into *Old-Spring-Garden* near *Charring-Croſs*: And Sold by *Matthew Turner* at the *Holy-Lamb* in *Holbourn*; And *John Lane* at the Corner of *Wild-ſtreet*, 1688.

Harvard College Library.
Treat Fund
March 25, 1935.

OF THE MOST Holy Sacrament OF THE EUCHARIST.

CHAP. II.

LET us now ſpeak a little of the *Euchariſt*, if in treating of ſo great a Subject it may be lawful to ſay but little. Do not thou, O Lord, leave us, to whom thou haſt left thy ſelf; but reſtore Sight to the blinded *Sectaries*, that they may courageouſly acknowledge this thy Gift, which is ſo wonderfully great, that they believe it not only above themſelves to Receive, but alſo above thee to Give. For, as nothing more frequently deters the *Jews* from embracing the *Chriſtian Faith*, than their being oblig'd to believe in it, that the living GOD, the GOD of *Abraham*, became Man, led a mortal Life, and died on a *Croſs*: So nothing more offends many of our *Sectaries* than the Excellency of this *Sacrament*, whilſt they cannot perſuade themſelves, the Bounty of CHRIST could ever make him ſtoop ſo low, as to permit that very Body to be held in the Hands of *Prieſts*, and receiv'd by the Mouths of *Sinners*, which, having been once extended on the *Croſs*, now *ſits in Glory at the Right-hand of the Father.*

But there is not, O ye *Sectaries*, any greater prejudice againſt you, than the univerſal Agreement of all *Chriſtians* in their Belief of the *Euchariſt* at ſuch time, as you firſt began to appear, and the exceeding great Diſagreement amongſt your ſelves in this your Errour. Is it probable, that there was then no Church in the World, which had a right Belief of this *Sacrament*? Or muſt we think, the Spirit of Truth reſides in you, who in this ſo great Affair conteſt more fiercely with one another, than with Us? All *Chriſtians* in the World, *Latines*, *Greeks*, *Armenians*, *Abiſſines* and *Muſcovites*, had at that time one and the ſame Senſe of that Sacred Myſtery. They all, I ſay, (except a few *Huſſites* in *Bohemia*, who as they were none of Ours, ſo neither are they Yours, there not being any amongſt you altogether of this Opinion concerning the *Euchariſt*) agreed with Us (and ſtill do) that under the *Species* or Appearance of *Bread* and *Wine* the *Body* and *Blood* of CHRIST are really Conceal'd; that there is no *Bread*, no *Wine* remaining; that the *Euchariſt* is therefore to be Ador'd, becauſe there is in it no other Subſtance but CHRIST himſelf.

But you, O ye *Sectaries*, were nothing mov'd with this general Conſent of *Chriſtians*. You departed from them all, that is, you reſolv'd to be *Hereticks*. Nor did you all take one way; but having once left the well known Path of the Church, *You wander'd in your own Inventions*: So that if any one enquires, what your Thoughts are of the *Euchariſt*, you are fain to tell him a long Story, which in the end wants an *Oedipus* to unfold it. For ſo numerous are your Diſſenſions concerning this Point, that there are reckon'd amongſt you above fourty different Opinions, altogether contrary to each other. Nay farther, you do not ſufficiently explain, or to ſpeak more truly, do not well underſtand, what the ſeveral *Sects* amongſt you hold. Thoſe of you which follow *Luther*, confeſs, that our Lords *Body* is really contain'd in this *Sacrament*, though they think withall the *Bread* ſtill to remain. The *Hugonots*, *Engliſh*

Pro-

Proteſtants, and other *Calviniſts* affirm on the contrary, that it is nothing but meer *Bread*; becauſe, ſay they, CHRIST *is ſitting at the Right-hand of the Father*, and therefore cannot be in ſeveral places. Others think otherwiſe; But theſe two are the moſt eminent Opinions amongſt you. Let us now ſee, how abſurd they both are.

The *Lutherans* confeſſing CHRIST's Body *to be really preſent*, deny nevertheleſs, that 'tis to be Ador'd. And behold, how excellently they Reaſon! For, ſay they, CHRIST inſtituted not this *Sacrament*, that it might be Ador'd, but that it might feed our Souls. Why do they not alſo ſay, that Kings and Princes ride a Hunting for Recreation, and not to be Reverenc'd by their Subjects: And that they are therefore miſtaken, who, when they meet their King, as he is Hunting, pay him the Reſpect, due to their Soveraign? CHRIST was on the *Croſs*, *That he might ſave the Souls of many*, and bear the Reproach, which was due to us; not that he might be there Ador'd. Hadſt thou, O *Lutheran*, been then preſent, wouldſt thou have thought it a Crime to have Proſtrated thy ſelf on Earth, and Ador'd him hanging on the *Croſs*. What madneſs is it in thee, not to Adore CHRIST, wherever he is; who, wherever he is, is GOD, the Diſpoſer of thy Life, and Judge of thy Soul?

But this Opinion of the *Lutherans*, which aſſerts the *Bread* to remain in the *Euchariſt*, is no leſs contrary to Scripture, than to the Doctrine of the Primitive Church. For if the Bread and CHRIT's Body were both there, CHRIST would not have ſaid, *This*, but here, *is my Body*; nor yet would he have ſaid, *The Bread*, but In the Bread, *which I will give is my Fleſh*. And if the Church in the Apoſtles Time had not believ'd with Us, that there is no Subſtance of *Bread* remaining in the *Euchariſt*, St. *Juſtin Martyr* would not have written, that this *Sacrament*, after the words of Conſecration are pronounc'd, *Is the Fleſh and Blood of that Incarnate Jeſus*; but that after the Conſecration, that Fleſh and that Blood are

added

added to the *Euchariſtical Bread* and *Wine:* Nor yet would St. *Cyril* of *Hieruſalem* have us'd theſe words, *This which We ſee, is not Bread, though the taſte thinks it to be Bread; but 'tis the Body of* CHRIST; But he would rather have taught Us, that the Bread, which is ſeen, is Bread, and the Taſte not deceiv'd in it; but that with the Bread is joyn'd CHRIT's Body.

Nor do the *Calviniſts* talk more wiſely, when they ſay, that CHRIST's Body is not really preſent in the *Sacrament*; but yet that we are really Partakers of it. An Opinion ſo Fooliſh, and ſo Deſtructive to it Self, that they themſelves underſtand it not. For tell me, O *Sectary*, canſt thou really receive CHRIST's Body, and CHRIST not be really preſent? But thou ſayſt, He is always in Heaven; and cannot be in ſeveral places at once. Thou then being only on Earth, and he only in Heaven, how can his Body really come to thee? And when at the ſame Inſtant thou Communicat'ſt at *London*, another at *Geneva*, by what Art can it be effected, that ye ſhould be really Fed with CHRIST's Body, if CHRIST cannot be really preſent in two places at once?

Wilt thou ſay, that thy Soul by Faith flies up into Heaven, and is there really Fed with this Holy Food? This is nothing to the purpoſe. For though thou mayſt by Faith, by Thought, by Will mount above the *Stars*, and Converſe in the midſt of Heaven; yet art thou ſtill really on Earth: Nor is any part of thee; that is, either thy Mind, or Body *really* in Heaven, there to receive Nouriſhment. Shouldſt thou never ſo Seriouſly fix thy Thoughts on *Rome*, or on *Hieruſalem*; couldſt thou be therefore ſaid to be really at *Rome*, or in *Hieruſalem?* It remains therefore, that thou ſhew, how thy Soul, which aſcends not really into Heaven, can be really Fed with the Fleſh of CHRIST, unleſs CHRIST be truly and really on Earth, and there alſo in many places at one and the ſame time, ſince many of you at the very ſame moment Communicate both in *England* and *France*.

But

But thou wilt Reply, thou art indeed ignorant of the manner; yet certainly knowſt, that thou art Fed. Is it ſo? If thou knowſt not, by what means theſe things are done, then art thou not ſure, but it may be by *Tranſubſtantiation*. Why then doſt thou with ſo great Boldneſs and Fury inveigh againſt it? But be it, that thou knowſt not the Manner; yet thou at leaſt knowſt, that the Manner is ſuch, as may not in Thought and Faith only, but in very Deed, joyn thee to CHRIST's Body, or elſe thou muſt confeſs, that thou doſt not indeed receive CHRIST's Body.

For thou ſayſt, that by *Faith* thou eateſt our Lords Body. Now what doeſt thou mean by theſe words? That thou by Faith hold'ſt and believ'ſt, Vertue ſo to flow into thy Soul from the Body of CHRIST, who is in Heaven, that thou art thereby in ſome ſort united to him? But this, O *Sectary*, is not really to receive CHRIST's Body, 'tis at moſt to receive it but imaginarily. For that Power, and thoſe Vertues, which thou ſay'ſt, flow from CHRIST into thee, are not indeed CHRIST's Body: And thou believeſt that thou receiveſt really nothing elſe. Nor doſt thou, I ſuppoſe, eat theſe Vertues. Why therefore to elude the Sentence of the *Fathers*, who teſtify, That CHRIST's *Fleſh and Blood is in very deed receiv'd*; do you make uſe of ſuch vain Deceits, ſaying, that you alſo hold the ſame? But if thou ſay'ſt, that thou *by Faith* apprehend'ſt, and believ'ſt CHRIST's Body to be really Communicated to thee; I anſwer, that this Faith of thine is, even in thine own Judgement, falſe and ridiculous, as making thee believe, that which is not: Since in thy Opinion our Lords Body is no where but in Heaven, and thou art really no where but on Earth.

But becauſe thou frequently appeal'ſt to the *Scriptures*, come and let us hear, what they ſay. In St. *Matthew* (Chap. xxvi.) our Saviour ſays, *This is my Body, this is my Blood*: In St. *Mark* (Chap. xiv.) *This is my Body, this is my Blood*: In St. *Luke* (Chap. xxii.) *This is my Body; this*

is

is the Chalice of the New Teſtament in my Blood: In St. *John* (Chap. vi.) *Unleſs ye ſhall eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye ſhall not have Life in you*: And St. *Paul* in his firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* (ch.xi.) pronounces him who comes unworthily to the *Euchariſt*, *Guilty of the Body and Blood of our Lord.* Theſe are plain Words, no perplex'd Teſtimonies, nor things mention'd but once. By which being clearly vanquiſh'd, you preſently fly to an Expoſition; whereas, when any thing ſeems to favour you, ye ſtick cloſe to the letter, refuſe all Interpretation, and cry out, we muſt adhere to the Word of GOD. As if you were the ſole Judges, and had Authority, at your pleaſure, one while to decide by the bare Text of Scripture, without admitting any Expoſitor; and ſoon after to appeal to Interpretations, and thoſe only of your own Invention.

But come on: What do you object againſt us? Arguments you ſay, taken out of the *Scriptures.* Firſt, that the *Euchariſt* is ſometimes in the *Scripture* call'd *Bread and Wine.* Next, that CHRIST ſaid in St. *John* (chap. vi.) *It is the Spirit that quickneth, the Fleſh profiteth nothing. The words, which I have ſpoken unto you, are Spirit and Life.* Laſtly, That CHRIST ſits at the Right-hand of the Father, and ſhall come from thence to Judge the quick and the dead. But I anſwer, that theſe words are more obſcure, than thoſe you would have explain'd by them, to wit, *This is my Body; my Fleſh is Meat indeed.* Now what kind of *Philoſophy* is this, to explain one Obſcurity by a greater; or, that I may ſpeak more truly, to gather the Senſe of a clear place from a dark one? But what, if we ſhould ſay, that theſe Places, you object againſt us, are to be interpreted by thoſe, we have alledg'd? What if we deny, that you have any more Right to expound them, than we? You bring only doubtful Arguments, and ſuch, as will be turn'd upon your ſelves. Nor will it be any great labour briefly to ſolve them all.

The

The *Euchariſt*, you ſay, is in the *Scriptures* call'd *Bread* and *Wine*. Therefore the *Scriptures*, you ſay, acknowledge *Bread* and *Wine* to be truly in that *Sacrament*. Proceed, *Sectary*, and by the ſame Argument more cloſely preſs us in this manner. The *Catholicks* in their Diſcourſes and Prayers frequently call the *Euchariſt* Bread: They believe therefore, that there is in it true *Bread*; and not only our *Lords Body*. Is not the reaſon and ſtrength of the Argument the ſame? Why will you rather make the *Scriptures*, when they mention the *Euchariſt* by the Name of *Bread* and *Wine*, to aſſert true *Bread* and *Wine* to be therein, than us *Catholicks*, when we call it by the ſame Names?

Give me leave therefore thus to retort this Argument upon you. In the *Catholick Church* we often term the *Euchariſt Bread* and *Wine*; and yet believe not any Subſtance of *Bread* or *Wine* to be therein. Therefore it cannot from the *Scriptures*, uſing the ſame Names, be concluded, that they acknowledge true *Bread* and *Wine* to remain in it. Lay aſide, *Sectary*, the prejudice of thy *Faction*, and tell me, whether thou art not more juſtly overthrown by the ſame Argument, with which thou aſſaulted'ſt us. For, that we often ſtyle this *Sacrament Bread* and *Wine*, is ſo well known to thoſe, who live amongſt us, that 'twere Impudence to deny it, and groſs Ignorance not to know it. How often do we deſire, that not only the Eating, but the Effect of this *Bread* may be granted us? How often do we beg of GOD the Father, that this *Bread* may be to us not a pledge of Death, but of Glory? And all this by Similitudes and Figures. Which kind of Speeches you your ſelves alſo do not deny to be frequent in Holy Writ. So St. *Bernard* (whom none can without bluſhing deny to be ours) calls the *Euchariſt Bread*, when in his firſt Sermon on the ſixth *Sunday* after *Pentecoſt* diſtinguiſhing *Bread* into ſeveral *Species*, he ſays, *Moreover the ſeventh kind of Bread is the Euchariſt, becauſe our Saviour ſays, the Bread, which I give, is*

my Fleſh for the Life of the World. We therefore with the *Scriptures* call this Sacrament Bread: Both becauſe, as the Natural Man lives by Bread, ſo does the Spiritual Man by the *Euchariſt*. To ſignify which, CHRIST commanded it to be made of *Bread* and *Wine*, and many of the *Fathers* by *Our daily Superſubſtantial Bread*, which we are taught to Pray for, underſtand this Heavenly Food. And alſo, becauſe it is in the Form of *Bread*; but principally becauſe 'twas *Bread* before. For we often call a thing, that now is, by the Name it formerly had. And how often have you heard from our *Writers* the Example of *Aaron*'s Rod, which, being turn'd into a *Serpent*, was certainly no longer a *Rod*, unleſs you will ſay, that GOD rather put an Illuſion on *Pharaoh*'s Eyes, than by a real Miracle admoniſh'd him of his Majeſty; and yet even then it was call'd a *Rod*: to wit, Becauſe it had from a *Rod* been chang'd into a *Serpent*: *And they all caſt down their Rods, which were turn'd into Serpents; but* Aaron's *Rod devour'd their Rods*, Exod. Chap. vii. But not to ſay much againſt ſo weak an Argument. The *Scriptures* call the *Euchariſt Bread*: Be it ſo. The *Antient Fathers* have often done the ſame: And we alſo do the ſame. Why then may we not be believ'd to think with thoſe, with whom we ſpeak?

Nor is the Arrow of any greater force, they ſhoot againſt us from theſe words of our Lord: *It is the Spirit which quickneth, the Fleſh profiteth nothing.* For if they will have them ſimply underſtood, *That the Fleſh of Chriſt profiteth nothing*; I would ask them, why they then ſay, that our *Lord's Body* is receiv'd by them in the *Euchariſt*: Nay, why CHRIST ſaid, *Unleſs ye ſhall Eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and Drink his Blood, ye ſhall not have Life in you.* Do they think that CHRIST contradicted himſelf? Or will they deny it to have been always believ'd in the Church, that CHRIST's *Fleſh profiteth the Receiver?* They muſt ever be fain to diſtinguiſh between the manner,

ner, how our Lord's Fleſh, being receiv'd, profits, and how it profits not. They muſt, to wit, acknowledge, that the *Capharnaits* hearing CHRIST's Words, fancy'd to themſelves ſome groſs, unworthy, and carnal manner, in which he would affirm, he ſhould be eaten: *My Fleſh ſo taken, as you in your ſelves imagine, profits not: I will give my ſelf in a more Noble and Spiritual manner than you believe. and being by you taken for Food, will quicken your Souls.* And thus of the manner of taking, and not meerly of the taking it ſelf, did CHRIST ſay, *The Fleſh profiteth nothing.* Let us now ſee the Force of your Argument. CHRIST ſays, *His Fleſh taken as the* Capharnaits *fancy'd, will profit nothing*: Therefore, ſay you, it will not profit, being taken in ſuch manner, as the *Catholicks* believe: But thou muſt firſt, O *Sectary*, prove, that we think, as the *Capharnaits* did, and that we will not hear the Spirit, *which quickens.* Now both theſe are falſe. The *Capharnaits*, as is manifeſt from the *Scriptures*, had no higher conceit of our Saviours words, than that he promis'd, His Body ſhould be eaten as other Meats; that it ſhould be divided into parts, taſte like Fleſh, and being taken Conſume. We in a *Spiritual quickning Senſe* believe, that CHRIST is indeed truly and really preſent in the *Euchariſt*. but after a Spiritual and Incomprehenſible manner; that he is receiv'd by us, whole, inviolate, and never conſuming. Thus will there be a mutual agreement between thoſe words of our Lord, by which he aſſerts, that *His Fleſh is truly given for Meat*; and thoſe others, by which he ſhews, that, if you underſtand this matter Carnally with the *Capharnaits*, *The Fleſh profiteth nothing.* Now if you deny, that *the Fleſh of our Lord* is any way profitable, you will contradict thoſe words, *Unleſs ye ſhall Eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, ye ſhall not have Life in you.* But if you ſay, that 'tis in ſome manner, but not in that *Capharnaitical* one, both receiv'd and profitable: This indeed we ſhall readily grant, but ſhall

withall add, that this Holy manner is in our Church, and that neither theſe Texts, nor any other, have any thing to the contrary.

You ſay laſtly, that the *Scriptures* often affirm, that CHRIST is, and ſhall be in Heaven, till he ſhall come in great Majeſty at the end of the World: And that therefore he cannot be on Earth, in the *Euchariſt*, in the Hands of the *Prieſts*. The Anſwer is ready. CHRIST is and ſhall be in Heaven in that great and viſible Majeſty till the end of the World. He is not ſeen publickly by us in that Brightneſs, nor is he yet ſo much as Converſant amongſt us, to receive thoſe Offices, which may be indeed profitable to a Body. Such, as St. *Mary Magdalen* perform'd, when ſhe Anointed him, and in reſpect of which our Saviour ſaid, *The poor you have always with you; but me you have not always.* He will not therefore come down from Heaven *In the Glory of His Majeſty* till the calling of all Men to Judgment. But he is often preſent at our Affairs in another manner, after another Faſhion, with leſſer State; he is, I ſay, often truly and really preſent with us here on Earth. He appear'd in the way to St. *Paul*, as he was going to *Damaſcus*, and ſpake to him in the way. So ſays *Ananias* to St. *Paul* (Act. ix.) *Our Lord* JESUS *hath ſent me, who appear'd to thee in the way, as thou cameſt.* And *Barnabas* declar'd to the Apoſtles, *How* Paul *had ſeen our Lord in the way, and that he had ſpoken to him.* And (*Acts* xxxiii.) *Now the night following our Lord, ſtanding by him, ſaid, Be conſtant, for as thou haſt teſtify'd of me in* Hieruſalem, *ſo muſt thou teſtify at* Rome *alſo.* And laſtly, (Act. xxvi.) *I am* JESUS, *whom thou Perſecuteſt. But ariſe, and ſtand upon thy feet: For to this end have I appear'd to thee, that I may ordain thee a Miniſter and Witneſs of thoſe things, which thou haſt ſeen, and of thoſe things, in which I will appear to thee.* And ſay not, that, 'twas an Angel, who having taken CHRIST's ſhape, appear'd to St. *Paul.* For to let paſs its being diſtinguiſh'd

ſtinguiſh'd in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, when our Saviour or when an Angel appear'd to St. *Paul*, he himſelf has in his firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* (Chap. xv.) taken away the doubt, where, after he had, to prove CHRIST's Reſurrection to them, affirm'd him to have been ſeen after his riſing again by his Apoſtles and Diſciples, he adds, *And laſt of all he was ſeen of me alſo, as of an Abortive.* Now 'tis certain, that this his being ſeen of St. *Paul* was not till ſome years after the day of his Aſcenſion: For St. *Paul* was a long time a Perſecutor, not an Apoſtle. 'Tis certain alſo, that 'twas not an Angel, but CHRIST himſelf, who thus appear'd to St. *Paul*: Since he affirms him to have been the ſame, that was ſeen by St. *Peter* and the other Apoſtles, to aſſure them of his Reſurrection. For ſure thou wilt not ſay, that 'twas an Angel, and not our Lord himſelf, that appear'd to the Apoſtles during the fourty days, which were between the *Paſch* and his *Aſcenſion*. Childiſh moreover would St. *Paul*'s Argument be, were it thus to be underſtood, that CHRIST was undoubtedly riſen, becauſe he had ſeen an Angel in CHRIST's Shape. Our Lord was then really preſent *on Earth* with St. *Paul*, and has been ſo with ſeveral other Saints. He is really alſo preſent with us in the *Sacrament*, but cover'd with the Form of a Creature, and under Vails, that conceal the Creator.

And do'ſt thou ſtill ſay, thou doubt'ſt, whether the Body, which is in Heaven, can be alſo on Earth? Aſſuredly, *Sectary*, it can. Our Lord's Body can be at one time in two ſeveral places: And if in two, why not in Infinite? For what hinders our Bodies, that they cannot be at once in ſeveral places? Is it not the condition of our Nature? But why cannot he, who fram'd our Nature, change alſo its Laws? This is the humble Learning, this is the *Chriſtian Philoſophy* of the Primitive Church. St. *Ambroſe* (lib. 11 *Hexam.* cap. 11.) has this Expreſſion: *Since his Word is the beginning of Nature, he may*

by

by right assume the giving the Law to Nature, who gave it its Original. And again (lib. 3. *Hexam* cap. 11.) *The Word of GOD is the efficient Cause of Nature.* But this perhaps thou can'st not sufficiently comprehend: No more indeed canst thou comprehend GOD; and yet GOD is is not therefore less GOD. If thou measurest the Works of GOD by the extent of thy Understanding, how weak, how obscure, how depending on thy self thou wilt make him! Thy Strength of Understanding depends on him, and not his Power on thy Understanding.

But is there any greater difficulty in granting one Body to be in several Places, than two Bodies to be in one; or admitting, as the *Ppilosophers* speak, *A Penetration of Dimensions?* The difficulty is altogether equal. Now CHRIST brought his reviv'd Body through Stone, *Which was very great at the Door of the Monument*, that is, he shew'd, there might be a *Penetration of Dimensions*, whenever he pleas'd: For the Stone was not roll'd away by the Angel, till St. *Mary Magdalen* came to Anoint our Lord. Mary Magdalen *came, and the other* Mary *to see the Sepulchre: And behold there was a great Earthquake: For the Angel of our Lord descended from Heaven, and coming roll'd back the Stone, and sate upon it*, &c. *And the Angel Answering, said to the Women, Fear not you*, Mat. chap. 28. After Christ came to his Disciples through close and solid Walls. *And when it was late that day, the first of the Sabbaths, and the Doors were shut, where the Disciples were gathered together for fear of the* Jews, *JESUS came, and stood in the midst*, &c. Joh. chap. 20. Again, *JESUS came, the Doors being shut, and stood in the midst.*

Here some of you are not asham'd to pretend certain unworthy Trifles, that CHRIST perhaps came in at the Window, or descended by the Tunnel of the Chimney, or open'd the Doors, which before were shut: An impudent saying, proceeding, if I am not mistaken, from men, who seek to gain Repute by inconsiderate Cavilling.

Is

Is it then to no purpoſe, that we hear theſe Words ſo carefully repeated: *When the Doors were ſhut: The Doors being ſhut?* To what end did St. *John* uſe theſe Words, but to ſignify CHRIST's miraculous Entrance, at which himſelf was preſent? Why did he not add, that he came in at the Window, or the Chimney, or by opening the Doors, the ſhutting of which he had ſo diſtinctly noted: That he entred then, O *Sectary*, the Doors being ſhut, is nothing elſe, but that he entred againſt the Laws of Nature through the ſaid Doors. *Moreover*, ſays St. *Hierom* in his firſt Book againſt *Jovinian*, *He ſo entred the Doors being ſhut, which the Nature of Humane Bodies ſuffers not: Shall we therefore deny that our Lord and St.* Peter *had true Bodies, becauſe contrary to Nature they walk'd on the Waters?* St. *Ambroſe* on the four and twentieth Chapter of St. *Lukes* Goſpel has theſe Words: *But St.* Thomas *had juſt cauſe of Admiration, when he ſaw a Body brought in through Places unpaſſable to Bodies, all things being ſhut, and no place broken. And 'twas therefore a Miracle, how a Corporal Nature ſhould introduce it ſelf through an in penetrable Body, by an inviſible Paſſage, in a viſible appearance, eaſie to be touch'd, hard to be underſtood.* And in the ſame place, *Though St.* Peter *believ'd the Reſurrection, yet might he be troubled, when he ſaw our Lord on a ſuddain with his Body come in upon them into thoſe places, which were incompaſs'd with lock'd Doors, and cloſe Walls.*

Nor did CHRIST at his Reſurrection only, but at his Birth alſo ſhew this *Penetration of Dimenſions*, coming into the World from the Womb of his moſt Holy Mother without violating the Encloſers of her Virginity. St. *Auguſtin* in his two and twentieth Book of the City of GOD (chap. 8.) relates to this purpoſe a famous Miracle, hapening in his time. He ſays, *That* Patronia *a* Carthaginian *Matron, had obtain'd from a* Jew *a certain Ring, which ſhe wore bound to her naked Body with a Girdle for the Cure of her Diſeaſe. That, ſhe going afterwards in Pilgri-*

ma ge

mage to the Relicks of St. Stephen; *the Ring which ſhe wore, fell from her whole and unhurt; the Girdle to which it was ty'd, remaining whole alſo; that the* Judaical *Remedy might by a* Chriſtian *Miracle be remov'd from this Woman before ſhe was heal'd through the Martyrs Interceſſion.* He further adds, *They believe not this, who believe not, that our Lord JESUS was brought forth without detriment to his Mothers Virginity, and went in to his Diſciples the Doors being ſhut. But let them indeed enquire of this, and if they find it true, believe thoſe. She is a Woman of Quality, nobly Born, nobly Married, and dwelling at* Carthage; *The largeneſs of the City, and the Dignity of the Perſon will not ſuffer the Truth to be conceal'd from the Enquirers. The Martyr himſelf, by whoſe Interceſſion ſhe was Cur'd, certainly believ'd in the Son of her, who remains a Virgin; in Him, who went in to his Diſciples, the Doors being ſhut.*

Theſe then are the *Scripture Hiſtories* of our Lords Nativity and Reſurrection; this the Primitive Churches Senſe of thoſe Hiſtories; that two Bodies may, GOD commanding it, be together in the ſame place; or, to ſpeak with the *Phyloſophers*, that there may be a *Penetration of Dimenſions* by the Divine Power. Now 'tis certainly no leſs repugnant to humane Senſe and Nature, that two Bodies ſhould be thus together in one place, than that one ſhould be at the ſame time in many. The difficulty on both ſides is not only alike, but the very ſame. The Church has always acknowledg'd both of them above the force of Nature, but below the Power of GOD, having ever taught her Children, that CHRIST both penetrated the Walls, and is preſent in the *Bleſſed Sacrament* in ſeveral places at once.

But there are three things, which you, O *Sectaries*, cannot well digeſt: The Name of *Maſs*, the *Euchariſts* being term'd a *Propitiatory Sacrifice*, and laſtly the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation.* The *Maſs* is to you ſo hateful a Word, that the Hating of it is amongſt you a token

token of Love. And yet, were it not, that I confine my ſelf to that briefneſs, I began with, it might abundantly be ſhewn, that this Holy Word has always been us'd to ſignify the Celebration of the *Euchariſt*. 'Tis now about thirteen hundred years, ſince the time of St. *Ambroſe*, who in his Epiſtle to *Marcellina*, ſays, *I began to ſay Maſs:* And ſoon after, *I began to Pray unto GOD in the Oblation, that he would help*, &c. St. *Teleſphorus* Pope and Martyr, who might for his Age have ſeen St. *John* the Apoſtle, teſtifies the *Maſs* to have been in his Time, ordaining many things in the Celebration of it: Which very thing the *Sectaries* themſelves confeſs. For the *Magdeburgians* in their ſecond Century (cap. 10.) blame him for *Multiplying Maſſes, encreaſing their Ceremonies, and tying them to a certain time.* Behold, how, whilſt they unwarily accuſe *Teleſphorus*, they acknowledge the Antiquity of the *Maſs:* Confeſſing even the Name to have been us'd in the very beginning of the Primitive Church. But whatever becomes of the Name, let us conſider the thing it ſelf.

We ſay, that the Celebration of the *Maſs* is a Sacrifice truly and properly Propitiatory. You, or rather ſome of you deny it; for the more Learned agree, at leaſt tacitly, with us. *Iſaac Caſaubon* but few Months before his Death being in the Preſence Chamber of the moſt Serene King of *Great Britain*, I fell in Diſcourſe with him, as did alſo another Gentleman, a Courtier, but no *Catholick*; whom, were it neceſſary, I could eaſily Name. Paſſing from one thing to another, we hap'ned amongſt the reſt upon the *Euchariſt*, which I earneſtly defending, *You need not*, (ſaid *Caſaubon*) *take all this pains, I willingly profeſs, and do aſſert it to be manifeſt from the Rites of the Antient Church, that the* Euchariſt *is a Sacrifice; and not only a Sacrifice of Praiſe, as many amongſt us would have it, but a Propitiatory Sacrifice*; Sacrificium ἱλαστικόν. Theſe were his very Words: Thus did he in two Languages

expreſs, what kind of Sacrifice he thought it to be. I was not a little glad to hear him; whilſt the third perſon, who was preſent at our Diſcourſe, wondred at this his Opinion, affirming, that he was more ſtartled at theſe words, than at *an hundred Arguments of the Papiſts*. He can teſtify the Truth of this, being ſtill alive, and daily attending on the King. And he has been ſo far from being a *Catholick*, that it cannot be fear'd, he would advantage us by ſpeaking contrary to the Truth.

And the Oblation indeed of the *Euchariſt* is ſo frequently by the *Fathers* call'd *Sacrifice*, that the *Sectaries* no longer diſpute with us about the Name; but only about what is to be underſtood by it. *It cannot*, (ſays *Kemnitius*) *be deny'd, that the Antients, when they ſpake of the Celebration of the Lords Supper, us'd the words Sacrifice, Immolation, Oblation, Hoſt, and Victim; as alſo the Verbs to Offer, Sacrifice, and Immolate.* Hear therefore, *Sectary*, but St. *Auguſtin* alone, and thou wilt ſay, that the Church in his Age us'd not theſe Words as borrowed or *Figuratively taken*, but underſtood them in their proper, true and uſual Senſe; that the *Euchariſt* is a true Sacrifice, properly ſo call'd, and Propitiatory not for the Living only, but alſo for the Dead.

He relates therefore in the ninth Book of his *Confeſſions* (Ch. 11.) that his dying Mother ſpake thus, *Lay this Body any where, let not the Care of it trouble you in the leaſt: This only I deſire of you, that when you ſhall be preſent at our Lords Altar, you will there remember me.* And again, (Chap. 13.) he ſays of her, *She thought not of having her Body Sumptuouſly Bury'd*, &c. *She commanded us not this, but only requeſted, that ſhe might be remembred at thy Altar, where ſhe had without one days Intermiſſion conſtantly ſerv'd, whence ſhe knew the Holy Victim to be diſpens'd, by which the Hand-writing that was againſt us, is blotted out.* He had alſo before (Chap. 12.) ſaid more plainly; *Behold, when her Corps was carry'd out, we went and return'd without*

without Tears. Nor did I ſo much as weep at thoſe Prayers, we pour'd forth to thee, when the Sacrifice of our Redemption was offer'd for her; her Body now being plac'd near the Grave, before it was depoſited therein, as the Cuſtom there is; but I was all the day in ſecret exceeding ſad, &c. Thou hear'ſt now, O *Sectary*, not only St. *Auguſtin*'s Mother, not only St. *Auguſtin*, but the very Cuſtom and Senſe of the Church in that Age. *When the Sacrifice of our Redemption was offer'd for her.* Here thou haſt three things: That the Oblation of the *Euchariſt* is a Sacrifice; that 'tis alſo Propitiatory. For in vain, or impiouſly would the Church offer a Sacrifice to our Lord for the Dead, which could not render him Propitious to them. Thou haſt laſtly, The Church in that Age, wherein, you are wont to ſay, ſhe was yet Pure, by Publick Conſent Praying for the Dead. Hence the Matter is ſo clear and certain, that the Blindneſs of thoſe is to be lamented, who refuſe ſo clear a Light.

Now what is their Complaint againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*? Does the Word offend them? Or the Thing, that is ſignify'd by this Word? They ſay, 'tis a *Popiſh Fiction*, ſprung up under *Innocent* III. in the *Lateran* Council. To wit, Becauſe *Tranſubſtantiation* is there manifeſtly Decreed. Now, I ask, *Sectary*, if Pope *Innocent* deliver'd this Faith to us, who deliver'd it to the *Greeks*? For certainly they wholly agree with us in this matter. Would they, who have rejected our Communion, who hate the very Name of the *Roman Pontifs*, have all generally admitted, and inviolably held ſuch a Doctrine, of ſo great moment, ſo newly (as you would have it) devis'd by the *Latins*? But they have not the Word *Tranſubſtantiation*. What then? They hold and believe the Thing. For they believe that the *Bread* and *Wine* after Conſecration ceaſe to be ſuch, and that inſtead of them ſucceed the true *Body* and *Blood* of our Lord. Why then may we not believe, that the *Roman Church* holds

ſtill the ſame Faith, which ſhe held, before the Word *Tranſubſtantiation* came into uſe; when the *Greeks* at this very day uſe not the Word *Tranſubſtantiation*, and yet have in this matter altogether the ſame Belief with the *Romans*? Was not the Holy Trinity believ'd to be *Homouſian* or Conſubſtantial, before the Word *Homouſian* was ever taken up? What matter is it, if ſome *Significative* Word, lately found out by Divines, be received into uſe, as long as the thing ſignify'd by it, was before part of the *Chriſtian* Faith, though expreſs'd in other Words and Phraſes?

Now that the *Chriſtians* before the time of *Innocent* the III. had the ſame Belief of the *Euchariſt*, as we now have, may be eaſily ſhewn from approv'd Authors, who preceded *Innocent*. St. *Bernard* dy'd fifty years, before *Innocent* the III. was advanc'd to the *Pontificat*. Now what can be more expreſs than theſe words of his in his Sermon on our *Lords Supper*? *This is truly an Heavenly Favour, this is certainly an abundant Grace, this is ſurely a ſuper excellent Glory, that a Prieſt ſhould hold his GOD, and with his Hand give him to others.* But leſt he ſhould repeal theſe Teſtimonies by ſuch frivolous Exceptions, as you for the moſt part uſe (pretending, that an univerſal Darkneſs had then over-ſhadow'd all Mankind, and driven them into many and great Errors) let us go back to thoſe Ages, which were even in your own Judgment uncorrupted.

We have already given you not only the Judgment of St. *Auguſtin*, but alſo the Opinion and Practice of the Church deſcrib'd by him: That the *Euchariſt* is a Victim, whereby our Sins are effac'd; that 'tis a Sacrifice; that 'tis a Propitiation, which is offer'd to *GOD* for the Dead. You require thoſe, that are more Antient than St. *Auguſtin*? St. *Juſtin Martyr* the very next Age after the the Apoſtles in his ſecond Apology to the Emperor, has theſe Words. *As by the Word of GOD our Saviour*

JE-

JESUS CHRIST was Incarnate, and took Fleſh and Blood for our Salvation: So we are taught, that by Prayers taken from GOD's Word the Euchariſt, *by him made Food, with which our Blood and Fleſh are through mutation nouriſh'd, is the Fleſh and Blood of that Incarnate JESUS.* St. *Hilary*, who liv'd in the third Age of the Church, ſays in his eighth Book of the Trinity, *There is no room to doubt of the Truth of the Fleſh and Blood: For now both by the Profeſſion of our Lord himſelf, and our own Faith, it is truly Fleſh, and truly Blood.* St. *Gregory Nyſſen* of the ſame Age in his Catechetical Oration (chap. 37.) *We rightly believe, that the Bread, ſanctify'd by the Word of GOD, is truly chang'd into the Body of GOD the Word.* St. *Chryſoſtom* in his two and fiftieth Homily on St. *Matthew* ſpeaks thus, *Why ſhould he diſdain to give thee his Body, who did more, that is, laid down his Life for thee? Let us hear therefore, Prieſts, as well as others; how great, how admirable a thing is granted us; let us hear, I Pray, and tremble, he has deliver'd us Fleſh, he has ſet before us himſelf Immolated.* And St. *Cyril* of *Hieruſalem*, more Antient than St. *Chryſoſtom*, ſays in his fourth Catechiſm, *That a Chriſtian Man knows, and certainly holds, this Bread, which is ſeen by us, not to be Bread, though the Taſte thinks it to be Bread, but the Body of* CHRIST; *and the Wine, which is beheld by us, though it ſeem Wine to the Senſe of Taſting, yet not to be Wine, but the Blood of* CHRIST? What needs many Words? No Age of the Primitive Church, none of the Fathers diſſented. The Teſtimonies of all Ages and Writers have been formerly given thee by ſuch, as have thought good to handle this Argument more at large.

Let me now ſpeak to thee, O *Sectary*, if thou deſireſt to be cur'd. This is one of the greateſt Affairs in the *Chriſtian Faith*, whether in the *Euchariſt* be CHRIST himſelf, or only *Bread*, which is the Figure of CHRIST's Body: In ſo great a matter, and in which to err, is certain

tain Deſtruction; conſider, whether ſide is ſupported by the ſafeſt Arguments. As to the Scriptures, 'twould be Impudence to affirm, that there are clearer, or even as clear Words for you, as theſe are for us: *This is my Body, this is my Blood: The Bread, which I will give, is my Fleſh.* Some places therefore are plain and clear of themſelves; and others, which want Interpretation, we expound according to the Sentiments of Men certainly great and numerous, whoſe Wiſdom, Learning, and Piety were remarkable; and laſtly, as is moſt agreeable to the Divine Inſtitution, *This is my Body.* Now if you would underſtand, what the Senſe of the Church was from the Apoſtles time, it can no way better be underſtood, than by that of the Fathers, who then liv'd. But there is not any one of the Fathers, that have written of the *Euchariſt*, whom we approve not, or whom we refuſe for our Judge. For though ſome of them may have ſometimes us'd certain obſcure Words, which you alſo have endeavour'd to abuſe for the ſupport of your *Hereſies*; yet is there none of them that have ſpoken thus dubiouſly, who has not alſo other Words extant, which are plain and clear for us. Nay, moſt of them have ſo written, that aſſerting our Opinion, they cannot be ſo much as imagin'd to have the leaſt Word or Expreſſion, which favours your *Hereſy*. Then, if you have regard to the Conſent of *Chriſtians*, it muſt be confeſs'd, that not only the *Latin* and *Greek* Churches, but all Chriſtians throughout the whole World unanimouſly agree in our Opinion. So that which way ſoever you ſeek for Arguments, there are ſtill more for us: If the Learning of the Perſons be reſpected, we have far the greater part of Men, famous for Knowledge; if Ages, we have unqueſtionably more; if the number of Men, you may well be aſham'd to compare with us.

Thus being every way inferior to us, you have nothing remaining but your Obſtinacy, and vain Incredulity,

lity, which with you is call'd Prudence, or Wiſdom, wholly conſiſting in ſuch kind of *Philoſophy* as this: Can GOD do this; or is it likely, that he would; what Inconveniencies hence ariſe; how unworthy is this of the Divine Majeſty? After the ſame manner did the *Heathens* put up Queries againſt CHRIST, and the *Arians* againſt the Trinity. Away with this vain Solicitude: You may poſſibly ſometimes know, why GOD's Works are done; but never how. Give me leave to uſe the Words of St. *Ambroſe*, *Who* (ſays he, 11 Hexam. Chap. 1.) *ſeeing theſe things, can with his weak underſtanding ſearch out a poſſibility of the Reaſon? All which the Divine Power, not to be comprehended by humane Minds, nor expreſs'd by our Diſcourſes, has knit together by the Authority of his own Will.*

But if thou, O *Sectary*, art not mov'd by our Agreement, let the blind Contention, that is among your ſelves, ſtartle thee: Since divided into *Sects*, you with great bitterneſs contend about the Opinion, you ought to have of this *Sacrament*. Would to GOD thou kneweſt, how pleaſant it is to proſtrate thy ſelf before the Altar, *Where the Angels* (ſays St. *Chryſoſthm* in his third Homily on the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*) *with Trembling Reverence the Hoſt*: How ſweet it is there to Adore our Lord, *Who* (to uſe St. *Auguſtin*'s words in his Commentary on the 98 *Pſalm*) *walk'd here in the Fleſh, and gave the ſame Fleſh to be eaten by us for our Salvation*: How far laſtly it excells all humane Delights to reject vain Circumſtances, and believe only the Word of GOD, to which ſo many foregoing Ages have Aſſented; to acknowledge that to be our *Lords Body* which our Lord himſelf has affirm'd to be his *Body*; and with a Mouth of *Fleſh* to receive in all due Humility the *Fleſh* of our Lord, that he may nouriſh our Souls with the effect of the *Sacrament*, and the Spirit *which quickneth*. None ſhall before the Tyranny of *Antichriſt* deprive the *Faithful* of theſe Joyes, nor can any one, but he, who has experienc'd them, comprehend them.

The End of the ſecond Chapter.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THere being many Excellent Pieces of the ſame Author, containing a *Direct*, *Short*, and *Full* Proof of all thoſe Points commonly Objected to *Roman Catholicks* by *Sectaries*, as having furniſh'd a *pretended Occaſion* of their *Schiſm*: I deſign God willing, one by one to prepare them for the Preſs, that the World may ſee, how *unreaſonable* and *groundleſs* are all the Exceptions made againſt Us; and *Manifeſtly Repugnant* to God's *Holy Word*, and the *received Judgment* of all *Antiquity*.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THere being many Excellent Pieces of the ſame Author, containing a *Direct*, *Short*, and *Full* Proof of all thoſe Points commonly Objected to *Roman Catholicks* by *Sectaries*, as having furniſh'd a *pretended Occaſion* of their *Schiſm*: I deſign God willing, one by one to prepare them for the Preſs, that the World may ſee, how *unreaſonable* and *groundleſs* are all the Exceptions made againſt Us; and *Manifeſtly Repugnant* to God's *Holy Word*, and the *received Judgment* of all *Antiquity*.